

REMARKS

Claims 32-48 are pending in the application. The abstract is amended herein as suggested by the Examiner. The title was previously amended in the Preliminary Amendment and currently complies with the Examiner's suggestions.

Claims 32-48 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as being broader than the enabling disclosure. Applicant requests reconsideration.

Page 3 of the Office Action states that the specification is "enabling for accumulating a deposition by flowing a liquid across a vaporization surface" but "does not reasonably provide enablement for any accumulated deposition." Essentially, the Office argues that the claimed methods are only enabled for cleaning an accumulated deposition that is formed by flowing a liquid across the vaporization surface. Applicant traverses such an argument.

Notably, original claim 1 is directed to a method of cleaning a vaporization surface where the vaporization surface is used as an electrode to form a plasma within a vapor forming device. Original claim 1 does not require that such cleaning occurs by reason of liquid flowing across the vaporization surface forming an accumulated deposition. Instead, the original claim 1 method of cleaning occurs independent of any particular circumstance that may create a desire to clean the vaporization surface. The present specification further enables claims 32-48 at least on page 6, lines 5-7 and on page 11, lines 3-6. At least for such reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the lack of enablement rejection and allowance of claims 32-48 in the next Office Action.

Claims 32-48 stand rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,318,381. Applicant submits herewith a


timely filed terminal disclaimer obviating the need for such rejection. Applicant thus requests withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Applicant herein sets forth adequate reasons to establish patentability of all pending claims 32-48 and requests allowance of such claims in the next Office Action.

Applicant notes that a copy of Form PTO-1449 included with the Office Action apparently as Paper No. 5 shows the Examiner's initials indicating consideration of all references except for reference AR listed under Other References. Copies of such reference were submitted in the priority application which is sufficient for the present application as far as copies of the references are concerned. If the submitted reference copy is missing from the Office's files, Applicant would be pleased to provide an additional copy. Applicant requests complete initialing of the Form PTO-1449 listing reference AR and return of a copy with the next Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 06 Jun 2003

By: 
James E. Lake
Reg. No. 44,854